

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 6, 2014**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Llewellyn Farms - MathWizard 211 Bradenton Avenue**  
**14-004AFDP/CU Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**  
**(Approved 6 – 0) (Minor Text Modification)**  
**(Approved 6 – 0) (Amended Final Development Plan)**  
**(Approved 6 – 0) (Conditional Use)**
- 2. Everhart Advisors 6900 Perimeter Drive**  
**14-005CP Concept Plan**  
**(Discussion only)**
- 3. Zoning Code Amendment – Amendments**  
**14-006ADMC Administrative Request – Zoning Code Modification**  
**(Postponed prior to the meeting)**

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, Joe Budde and Victoria Newell. John Hardt was absent. City Council Woman Marilee Chinnici-Zuercher was present. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Jennifer Readler, Andrew Crozier, Kristin Yorko, Jordan Fromm and Flora Rogers.

Mr. Fishman moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Taylor seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was a case eligible for consent and asked if anyone would like to pull the case from the consent agenda. Mr. Taylor said he had questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined the order of the cases heard would be the order of the published agenda. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- 1. Llewellyn Farms - MathWizard 211 Bradenton Avenue**  
**14-004AFDP/CU Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for a minor text modification as part of an amended final development plan to add tutoring services as a conditional use within the existing development text for Llewellyn Farms. She stated the application is also a conditional use to permit tutoring services to operate within an existing office building for a site located on the south side of Bradenton Avenue, 200 feet west of its intersection with Chatterfield Drive. She explained that the Commission will need to make 3 motions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that anyone intending to address the Commission on this case please stand and she swore in the applicant and staff.

Jennifer Rauch presented this application and said the site has one access point that serves the applicants building and an existing office building and the owner of that building had provided the correspondence that was received. She said parking is to the south behind the building, she said the two different components to this application are the addition of tutoring services within the development text and a conditional use portion of that to approve them using it as that service. She said they are not making any modifications to the exterior of the site or the parking.

Ms. Rauch said the conditional use details of this is a tutoring services so the hours are after school and on the weekends. She said there are an average of 25 students at a time and 5 to 8 employees and the parking does meet Code and there is adequate access. She said Planning is recommending approval of the text modification through the amended final development with no conditions and approval of the conditional use with no conditions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant to step forward and state their name for the record.

Parag Singhal, 211 Bradenton Avenue, Dublin, Ohio said he was the owner of the business.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would to make comment with respect to this case. [There were none.]

Mr. Taylor said the letter that came in is exactly the concern he had before he saw the letter because he knows the area and is concerned about the traffic impacts given the residential neighborhood next door and has visited the other building that shares the driveway in the past and he tends to come in through the neighborhood and he wondered if that is something they will see a lot more of. He said he was surprised that he did not realize in reading the packet that this use already existed in this building.

Ms. Rauch said that this case came about through a sign permit request and Planning determined that the use is not actually permitted, but there is tutoring services located near other residential and office areas and it seems compatible.

Mr. Taylor said the traffic and parking was exactly what his concern.

Ms. Kramb said she can understand cars pulling up to the front door and dropping people off and two or three cars waiting it could back up into the street quickly. Ms. Kramb suggested some type of signage that prohibits stopping or parking at any time and that indicate that there is no drop off, so those people will have to go into the parking lot and park and make their kid walk on the sidewalk to the entrance. She said that would eliminate the concerns of the adjacent building blocking the access and they will not have cars waiting in the street waiting to get in because someone is dropping off.

Mr. Singhal said their concerns are right and based on the concerns of the neighbor they have made changes. He said they moved in this building in August of 2013 and in the beginning they did not know there were issues until the neighbor brought them to their attention. He said they have installed a "no drop off" sign in the front and made the entrance to their parking lot a "no right turn" and the traffic flow goes straight down and enters the parking lot. He said in the proposed changes to the building they are proposing to move the backdoor to the side to allow students to access the building and that should completely remove that situation of the dropping off in front.

Mr. Taylor asked that there be a condition to provide a comprehensive parking and traffic plan and signage that indicates what is going to be done and what has been done to make this work.

Ms. Kramb asked that they record on the plan what signs they have added to eliminate the traffic issues.

Mr. Taylor said he wants to make sure that staff verifies that the signage is going to provide a solution and if they are located in the correct place or say the correct thing and this is a significant issue that impacts his business and he not want to sign off on something when the solution is not adequate.

Ms. Rauch read the two conditions into the record:

- 1) That the applicant work with Planning to address the Commissions and the adjacent property owners concerns regarding traffic management on-site and on the adjacent site using appropriately worded and located signs; and,
- 2) That the applicant provide Planning with a traffic management plan demonstrating the efforts made to management onsite flow of traffic.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if Mr. Singhal agreed to the two conditions.

Mr. Singhal asked for clarification on the details of the traffic management plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said staff will contact him and will want to know what signs they are putting where and why they are being placed in that location and the two will work together to determine whether or not it is effective and they will come to an agreement.

Mr. Singhal agreed to the conditions.

#### **Motion #1 and Vote**

Richard Taylor made a motion, Victoria Newell seconded to approve modifications of the development text to include a provision to allow tutoring services as a conditional use for the office building existing at the time of this application on the south side of Bradenton Avenue, 200 feet west of the intersection with Chatterfield Drive in the Llewellyn Farms PUD, because as proposed the use is compatible with existing uses in the area. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

#### **Motion #2 and Vote**

Richard Taylor moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development plan because it complies with applicable review criteria. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

#### **Motion #3 and Vote**

Richard Taylor moved, Warren Fishman seconded, to approve this Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Planning to address the Commissions and the adjacent property owners concerns regarding traffic management on site and the adjacent site using appropriately worded and located signs; and
- 2) That the applicant provide Planning with a traffic management plan demonstrating the efforts made to management onsite flow of traffic.

\*Parag Singhal agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

**2. Everhart Advisors  
14-005CP**

**6900 Perimeter Drive  
Concept Plan**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is for review and non-binding feedback for a concept plan for a new 10,000-square-foot corporate office and associated site improvements on 3.8 acres located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Post Road and Perimeter Drive.

Jennifer Rauch presented this application and said it is a concept plan review for Everhart Advisors for the potential submission of a rezoning application and a subsequent final development plan for the location of their new corporate offices. She said the site is located on the south side of Post Road east of the intersection with Perimeter and made up of 5 different parcels and divided in the northern third by the county line. She said in the northern portion of the site there is an existing building and parking area which would be demolished as part of this proposal with an existing tree row that runs down the center of the northern two property lines and then along the southern and eastern portion of the eastern most parcel. She said there is a stream that runs through the northern portion with flood plain on either side of it.

Ms. Rauch said the existing site has three different zoning on it which is requiring the request for a concept plan and future rezoning. She said the site is zoned TF, Technology Flex District on the western parcels; SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District on the eastern parcels; and PCD, Planned Commerce Development District on the southern parcels as part of the Perimeter Liggett plan. She said the future land use map indicates the site as neighborhood office which permits lower lot coverage, greater setbacks and net density of 9500 square foot per acre which the proposal meets.

Ms. Rauch said the concept plan shows the two-story building in a similar location as the existing building on the site, with the main access point aligned with the existing curb cut on the south side of Perimeter Drive, which was previously determined by Engineering. She said the proposed entrance provides an access drive to the north to provide employee parking and visitor parking located south of the building. She said there are two stormwater areas located on the site as well as a bio retention basin located between the two parking areas. She said the applicant has indicated a combination of a ground sign and a wall sign along the Perimeter Drive frontage.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed architecture for this site includes a more modern design more in line with the Dublin Methodist Hospital design than the existing office buildings in this area that incorporate more brick and stone.

Ms. Rauch said Planning has identified five discussion questions in addition to any other questions the Planning and Zoning Commission would like to discuss. She said the first two are related to the site layout. She stated the proposed layout is linear across the site given the flood plain and the access point requiring a long access drive to reach the building and parking areas. She said the Washington Township Fire Department has expressed concerns about the maneuverability within the visitor parking and access to the building. She said also related to the existing trees, the plan indicates the retention of existing trees but based on their condition Planning has asked the applicant to engage an arborist to determine the health of the trees and ensure the trees are worth keeping. She said an arborist could help determine whether the trees warranted being removed to provide a different site layout or better access to this site. She said the first two proposed discussion questions are:

1. *Are the proposed building and parking sited appropriately given the existing site conditions?*
2. *Should limited tree removal in key areas be considered to accommodate a more efficient site layout, better access for fire, better views to the building?*

Ms. Rauch said the third discussion question relates to the stormwater management in that the proposal shows an alternative stormwater system. She requested the Commissions' feedback and discussion on

the alternative stormwater measures proposed given the traditional large wet ponds located within this area.

Ms. Rauch said two signs would be permitted based on the site details. She said the applicant is requesting a combination of two different signs, similar to what the Commission has aware approved elsewhere in the City.

Ms. Rauch said the final question relates to the architectural concept, which as highlighted proposed more modern materials and design than the existing buildings in this area with stone and brick materials, a gabled roof and a smaller scale building.

Ted Smith, Vorys Legal Counsel, on behalf of the applicant, said the Everhart Advisors is a Dublin based investment advisory firm currently with 15 employees. He said they view this as an opportunity to take what is currently an underutilized aspect of Dublin's doorstep to create a signature building to house Everhart Advisors growing business. He said there are multiple members of the development team to answer any questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that wished to make comment with respect to this case. [There were none.]

Ms. Newell said the rendering provided identified the stormwater areas as a retention area, but the description was a dry basin. She asked if the pond would hold water or not.

Bryan Lundgren, Osborn Engineering, said the stormwater management would be a combination of bio swale and detention areas and not a pond.

Ms. Newell said she is concerned with the bio swales because they do not have a lot of area where they are delineated and it is hard for them to function well and look nice. She said these areas usually end up looking like a ditch.

Mr. Lundgren said they wanted to make sure they have adequate space when designing the site layout with the existing trees to have the bio swales to function properly.

Ms. Newell said suggested they look at underground detention areas in combination with bio swales. She said the site is disjointed in the current layout. She said she realized they are trying to preserve the tree line and even with the significant screening created by the pine trees, some have not been appropriately groomed over the years. She said she is concerned with the circulation between the visitor parking and employee parking areas. She said doing a contemporary building is wonderful because of the traditional buildings in the area. She stated the hospital is a contemporary building where modern materials were used along with brick and stone that are complementary.

Ms. Newell asked if staff determined the access point should be aligned across from the curbcut across Perimeter. Ms. Rauch said Engineering has determined that it is the access point for this site.

Mr. Budde said the concept for determining which trees to save will help to answer the first question, because the line of large evergreens shields the view of the property and the signature building would not be able to be seen. He said he is concerned with the layout and fire access. He said he agrees with Ms. Newell comments regarding the building design and supported the idea of a modern building with quality materials. He said the signs make sense given the use and number of employees and the destination for clients to find.

Mr. Fishman said the neighborhood office buildings are very traditional in the area and the applicant should be careful to keep the materials more traditional with brick, stone and limit the metal. He said the

site seems to have a lot of good trees and they would need to replace any trees removed. He said the bio swale is a concern and he thought they were missing an opportunity to construct a retention pond in the open space. He said the proposed signs would be fine if they meet Code.

Ms. Kramb said she was happy to see an applicant not bulldoze the site and put a building in the center of the lot. She said she loves the way they are trying to save the trees and the layout of the site, she said the traffic needs to make sure it works and possibly provide a second access point off the visitor parking lot. She stated she likes the parking lots broken into two lots to avoid a sea of asphalt and the parking placed around the trees. She said she recommended the tree survey and appreciates the effort to save the trees. She said as long as the stormwater solutions look nice and function well she would be supportive. She said the building should be different and with high quality materials. She said she is fine with allowing two signs as long as they meet the height and size requirements. She said it is a good location and looks forward to seeing more details.

Mr. Taylor said the suggestions they have made for the outside of the building are great and there are a lot of design elements in this vocabulary to make an interesting building that will fit without mimicking what is in the area. He said the materials did not have to be traditional as long as they are unique and well done. He said the site layout is awkward and asked for further clarification about the access point.

Ms. Yorko said the curb cut on the south side of Perimeter Drive was predetermined when Perimeter Drive was built. She said this site must align with this access point.

Mr. Taylor asked what they know about the existing curb cut across the street and the future for that property.

Ms. Rauch said there are no plans at this point and indicated the other key factor regarding the access location was to ensure the distance between Post Road and the proposed access point are separated as much as possible.

Mr. Taylor asked what the minimum distance is from an intersection of that magnitude.

Ms. Yorko said there is not a Code required minimum, but the possibility exists that this may be a roundabout in the future they would want the access point as far south to not become a right-in, right-out for the applicant.

Mr. Taylor said his concern given the property across Perimeter is that it is a significantly larger property and there are no plans to do anything. He said he is concerned with holding this applicant to a location when the curb cut could be moved to align with this project. He said the layout is awkward and if they moved the access point to the north it would eliminate pavement, provide better circulation, and eliminate the need for two signs. He said he appreciates the new building to be placed in the existing building site, but was concerned the signature building was placed in the heaviest wooded area of the site and will not be seen unless it towers above the trees. He said he is not convinced this is the best location of the driveway even with the existing curb cut or possibility of a roundabout. He stated those elements are all future items that can be adjusted later to provide a better site layout for this proposal.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it is a tough site and to have three zonings is a tough task and is happy that they are willing to accomplish the task. She said she appreciates they did not come in and level the site and start over. She said a wet pond would be appropriate on this site. She said sites have tried bio swales and the hospital is an example of bio swales that have not been successful because they become a place for trash and cannot be maintained very easily. She said they need to be done better and expressed concern that the site is not large enough to accomplish this. She said it is a narrow piece of property with a large amount of pavement. She questioned if the applicant pulled the building back, combined the parking area and incorporated a water feature in close proximity to the building would

make a better site layout. She said she is not excited about the two different parking lots and extra square footage of asphalt. She stated she thought the site layout has some imagination left to explore and would prefer to see the parking moved down with a water feature. She said she liked the architectural examples and thought it would be appropriate for the area and would like to see some diversity in the architecture. She said the tree survey will help and preferred to see one stormwater component. She said she was supportive of a combination of wall and ground signs. She said she appreciates they are exploring new and different ideas and not just going with the same old same old.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant had any comments or questions for the Commission.

Matt Romeo, Everhart Advisors Group, 5368 Hawthornden Court, said the concerns they had as they looked at this unique site is the tree layout and wanted to make sure they are working together to figure it out. He said the challenge is how to gain visibility of a signature site and preserve as much as they can while looking at the economic impact. He said that is a challenge that they would look to the Commission to help them work through because it is important to their customers as a destination. He said they are excited to be expanding in Dublin and working together.

### **3. Zoning Code Amendment – Amendments**

**14-006ADMC**

**Administrative Request – Zoning Code Modification**

**(Postponed prior to the meeting)**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Zoning Code Amendment has been postponed and asked if there was a reason for the postponement and when it is expected to be rescheduled.

Ms. Readler said they are working through issues administratively with getting on Council agendas. She said they are just refining the Code and is nothing urgent, they just want to be consistent with what is in the Code with advertising on websites and other methods of communication that might get it out there. She said they are working on it and is going to bring back with more other comprehensive revisions to do all at once.

### **Council Presentation – Code of Conduct**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not know how many had an opportunity to review the email today that City Council had sent a Board and Commission Member containing the Code of Conduct. She said there are printed copies on the dais and Council Member Chinnici-Zuercher is here to provide a brief presentation about this.

Council Member Chinnici-Zuercher thanked the Commission for allowing her to be added to the agenda. She said last year the Council began to look at volunteer administration of the Boards and Commissions and Christine Nardecchia has very strict application and rules that she follows based on the profession of volunteer management and with the Boards and Commissions they were not falling within the scope of the administrative policies that they should have been for volunteers. She said one of the items is a Code of Conduct that they have had volunteers sign and if you volunteer for the City in other capacities then this Board or Commission might have signed one along the way. She said she has when she volunteers for the Dublin Irish Festival.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said they have created the Code of Conduct that is before them and it is just principles of the expectation for the people that are being appointed to Boards and Commissions. She said they expect people to come to the meetings, to be prepared, and to actively participate in the meeting because that is why they are appointing anyone to a Board or Commission. She said they expect the volunteers to be representatives of the City and to be an ambassador and speak highly of the City and sell the City to people that they are in contact with and it speaks to issues such as not receiving compensation unless the particular Commission gets that as part of the procedures. She said they are

expected to follow all the laws which when they are sworn in they are asked to follow the Dublin regulations and the State of Ohio and the Federal regulations as well. She said it was important to update the applications and require each applicant to be a registered voter because they want people that are part of the process in creating a democracy in the community. She asked each Commissioner to please sign the Code of Conduct form and return to Anne Clarke. She said a Council Member is attending the Board and Commission meetings this month to give this presentation and ask for signatures.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Newell said she had already signed the form.

Mr. Taylor said the rules and regulations document for this Commission that has been updated and he reviewed it today and said it was redundancy between the two and asked if anyone has looked at it.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said it is required by the Charter that the Board and Commissions have rules and regulations and that is a separate requirement and there is nothing that prohibits them from having a code of conduct or having similarity in certain aspects.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wondered if it is more appropriate to incorporate the Code of Conduct principles into the rules and regulations, she said one of the things that this body is sensitive to is that they create a lot of documents that refer to other documents that when they change one document then they inadvertently affect another document.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said when she reviewed the rules and regulations they really speak more to the operations of the Commission and this Code of Conduct document is not about how they manage the Commission and make decisions, it is about how City Council wants a commitment from each of the people regarding being a volunteer and being appointed. She said it is not about procedurally how they are functioning as a Board or Commission. She said they see them as two distinct documents that serve different purposes.

Ms. Kramb said with being a legal person, the only item she is concerned with is the "I will be present for required meetings", she said it would be nice to have some leeway with it to try to the best of my ability to be present for required meetings. She said occasionally there is the time that something comes up and they cannot make a meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said their Rules and Regulations talk about missing no more than 4 meetings in any calendar year.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said procedurally you have that in there, but she thought it is the Council's expectation and while she recognizes everyone might have a situation come up where they are not able to attend, but when they appoint people they are told when the meetings are and they are expected to work to clear their calendar and attend the meetings. She said they want to make it clear to people that are appointed to a Board or Commission that the expectation is that they do come to every meeting.

Ms. Kramb said she understands, but the first statement is very absolute and she feels bad saying she will attend all meetings because she knows in the 6 years she has been on the Board she has missed maybe 2 meetings of regular meetings and is more comfortable saying she will be present to required meetings to the best of her ability or within the regulations. She knows there will be a time when she might miss one and then she has lied about the first statement.

Mr. Taylor said that is what he meant when he said there is couple of things that were in conflict with the rules and regulations. He asked if this governs conduct other than on official city business.



Ms. Readler said there are things that they are supposed to be positive within the community and with appointees and it is clear that you serve at the pleasure of Council.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said Legal did review all of the Code of Conduct before they implemented it within all the Boards and Commissions.

Ms. Kramb said so if they sign that they will be present for all required meetings and they miss one they have just lied.

Ms. Readler said that the more specific Planning and Zoning Commission rules would govern but again these are the traits that City Council wants in appointees and so as it has been noted that if there are even fewer than 4 absences they will take into consideration.

Ms. Kramb said they just want to be able to say if you do miss one meeting it would be a reason you did not follow through.

Ms. Readler said they do serve at the pleasure of Council and if you do miss one they could remove you for missing but could do so even without the Code of Conduct.

Ms. Kramb said these are ethics versus aspirational goals.

Ms. Readler said these are more than aspirational in that they are delineating the expectations of Council for appointees and something that people can see and understand fully understand when they are serving on the boards what the expectations are and for new members and it is viewed more for qualifications and terms of membership rather than rules of governance of meetings or rules of order.

Mr. Taylor said given that they are sworn in and agree to do all this stuff anyway he is uncomfortable with it but he gets a strong impression that this is nonnegotiable.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said this is what Council has approved and it has been through several iterations and legal has reviewed it as well as the administration and this is what the Council believes is appropriate in what they are trying to communicate to the Board and Commissions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she does not have a problem signing this specific document but is very curious why they would have multiple documents and perhaps the Rules and Regulations should be revised to incorporate these things so that they are not swearing into something and signing something else and it just seems that they are making multiple commitments to different things.

Ms. Kramb said the only one that is conflicting is number one.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher said she will take that back to Council and perhaps revisions will address that.

Mr. Fishman said this is the kind of citizen that Council wants and it is very reasonable and there such a thing of the spirit of the law and if he calls the chairman and informs them he has pneumonia and cannot make the meeting, the spirit of the law is being met in doing his best to make the meeting and thought everything on the document he likes and thought there should not be a Board member running around bad mouthing the City for example. He said when you are volunteering you want someone that is an advocate for the City and someone who wants to attend the meetings and didn't see anything unreasonable.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed and said she just thought it should be incorporated into the Rules and Regulations to have just one document.

Ms. Newell said she already signed the document and said she is officially missing the next meeting. She said they never want to miss a meeting and they tend to be there all the time and they all have jobs that occasionally get in the way and she completely understand why Council wants all the members present for all the meetings.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher thanked Warren Fishman because at the end of March he will be ending his tenure on the Planning and Zoning Commission and he is not eligible for reappointment at this time. She said he has been on and off all the different Boards for 30 years and has made a great contribution to the community and wanted to take the opportunity to say thank you for your service.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher for coming to give the presentation.

### **Communications**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Planning if there were any communications items to discuss.

Claudia Husak said there is a retirement party on Tuesday, February 25<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 in the 5800 Building for Libby Farley and asked the Commission to make it if they can.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was not anyone that was going to attend the APA National Conference this year. She said everyone was going to bank their points and attend next year's conference in Portland because it will be a very interesting conference.

Ms. Husak said Steve Langworthy has found another conference that is equally as interesting in Birmingham, Michigan.

Ms. Newell said that Birmingham, Michigan does meet the definition of mixed development and is a very walkable community.

Mr. Langworthy said it is on March 20<sup>th</sup> and is a one day workshop.

### **Roundtable**

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable topics.

Ms. Kramb said that she saw ART is reviewing the Casto Development and had planned that it come back on February 20<sup>th</sup> and wondered if they were going to have a chance to have the meeting with Engineering to review the traffic before the application comes back to the Commission.

Ms. Husak said based on the Commissions availability and everyone going to be in attendance she did not think that could happen. She said the Casto application is coming before the Commission as a basic plan review which is like a concept plan before the site plan review and it is also one of the first applications that the Commission will determine what the next step of review would be.

Ms. Kramb said that the basic plan review includes the street layout.

Ms. Husak agreed.

Ms. Kramb said she would have rather have the traffic questions answered prior to the basic plan because she will not be able to speak very intelligently on whether or not the application should move forward until she has the questions answered on traffic.

Mr. Fishman said there was an article in Business First about these kinds of developments in general about the timing and the commercial coming in with the apartments and it is a huge problem where the apartments are going in with the commercial not following.

Ms. Kramb said concept within her profession is called Independent Utility and basically projects have to stand alone on their own and have to assume nothing else will be built and she thought they really need to consider that in the concepts as they are reviewing the Bridge Street stuff. She said that is a concept they need to consider if they want the development if nothing else gets built and it is a factor or principle to consider because they do not want roads to be dead ended because the other did not happen and roads are not finished.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if this community had chased trends they would be full of big box stores and strip malls.

Ms. Kramb said basically they will not fund a project that will not work on its own.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that is why she was disappointed they did not continue the review of the Code today because they have a lot of work to be done and it would be very helpful to staff and meeting with applicants to hear what is coming down the pike with Code revisions because they kept calling them complete applications, but the term independent utility and applications need to come as complete units so if they have 400 dwelling units they assume there is going to be 800 people in those units and it should be able to justify 800 jobs to be a complete application and stand on its own and to be something that is truly urban and walkable and functioning like they want it to otherwise they just end up with big apartment complexes that are next or down the street from another big apartment complex.

Mr. Budde said he was at a continuing education class today and the final session was about working with Planning Commissions and it was interesting. He said one of the presenters who was with one of the major firms in town that does zoning work indicated when Dublin created and passed the Bridge Street District they had 12 clients all over them ready to discuss to move forward and doing things and it is interesting to say if this is the only thing that happens, when you talk to people there is a lot coming online in the future and there is a lot of people talking about Dublin and the Bridge Street District that have ideas of all the things that will be coming. He said he is excited about it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they come up with something for the traffic study discussion between now and then they would be flexible to accommodate a special meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no additional items of discussion and adjourned the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

As approved by Planning and Zoning Commission on March 13, 2014.